

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 25, 2007 was received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are pending, of which claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 are amended and are independent. Consequently, claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 remain pending. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for a One-Month Extension of Time* which extends the shortened statutory period of response to January 25, 2008.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-14 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0212573 to Sundahl et al. (Sundahl) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,479,940 to Ishizuka (Ishizuka) and claims 3, 9, 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundahl in view of Ishizuka as applied to claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 above, and further in view of JP-361261921A to Miyashita et al. (Miyashita). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

With regard to independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17, the Examiner asserts that Sundahl, taken in combination with Ishizuka, makes obvious the present invention. However, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to recite, *inter alia*, the features of “a temperature detection unit which detects a temperature data; an A/D conversion circuit which converts the temperature data into a digital data;” and have amended claims 7 and 17 to recite, *inter alia*, the features of “detecting a temperature data by the temperature detection unit; converting the temperature data into a digital data by A/D conversion circuit.” The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious for person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to use the feature of temperature compensation where the measured temperature signal of Ishizuka is added to element 440 of figure 4 in the display device of Sundahl so as to produce a device that is able to compensate for both aging and temperature degradation. However, Applicants contend that the assertion is not appropriate for the following reasons.

Sundahl suggests that the effective age of the device may be estimated by obtaining a measurement that is correlated with or related to the desired characteristic (paragraph 0026). However, Sundahl does not clearly teach or suggest the features of measuring the lighting time of pixel using **the digital video signal** for estimating the effective age of the device, as recited in claims 1, 7, 13 and 17.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that Ishizuka teaches temperature compensation by having a storage unit in which a temperature characteristic of the light emitting element is stored (col. 6, lines 58-62; the temperature characteristic is equivalent to a predetermined temperature). However, Applicants contend that Ishizuka does not disclose or suggest the temperature characteristic and the equivalent. The claimed temperature characteristic is the acceleration factor corresponding to each temperature (see page 5, lines 25-27 of specification) and is different from temperature itself (Ishizuka; col. 6, lines 58-62; a predetermined temperature).

Therefore, Applicants contend that even if the feature of temperature compensation where the measured temperature signal of Ishizuka is added to element 440 of figure 4 in the display device of Sundahl, the display device of the present invention would not result. Thus, it cannot be said that Sundahl, taken in combination with Ishizuka, makes obvious the present invention, as claimed.

Similarly, Miyashita fails to cure the deficiencies in Sundahl and Ishizuka, as

discussed above. Accordingly, amended independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 are allowable over the applied references, taken alone or in combination. The dependent claims are allowable over the applied references, taken alone or in any proper combination, on their own merits and for at least the reasons as argued above with respect to their independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of all dependent claims likewise be removed.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. #48103/
Sean A. Pryor

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080